

of life. * * * Act on the circulatory system of the uterus, thereby relieving painful, irregular and scanty menstruation, and assist in re-establishing or restoring, the menstrual or monthly periods * * * strengthen and build up the uterine function," (circular) " * * * a great relief against those general complaints the Female Sex is subject to; they help increase the vital quality of the blood; assist to bring nature into its proper channel * * * for irregular, painful, scanty or suppressed menstruations, * * * should be taken * * * to assist nature with * * * disorders * * * during the change of life period. * * * Continue with the treatment until they give relief. * * * great relief from Pains or Headache; * * * for suppressed menstruation. * * * continue their use until relieved * * * take * * * until the menstrual flow commences again," were false and fraudulent in that said article contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing the effects claimed.

On February 21, 1921, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

9368. Misbranding of Londonderry Water. U. S. * * * v. 3 Cases
 * * * of Londonderry Water. **Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction.** (F. & D. No. 14205. I. S. No. 5164-t. S. No. E-3048.)

On January 22, 1921, the United States attorney for the District of Massachusetts, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel of information praying the seizure and condemnation of 3 cases, more or less, of Londonderry Water, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Boston, Mass., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Londonderry Spring Water Co., Nashua, N. H., on or about June 21, 1920, and transported from the State of New Hampshire into the State of Massachusetts, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended. The article was labeled in part, "Londonderry Water * * * The Londonderry Spring Water Co., Nashua, N. H. * * *."

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the libel of information for the reason that the statement appearing in the labeling, "Guaranteed By The Londonderry Spring Water Co., Under The Food And Drugs Act, June 30, 1906, Serial No. 3139," was false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the following statements regarding its curative and therapeutic effect, "Beneficial for Rheumatism, Neuralgia, Dyspepsia, Eczema, Malarial Poisoning, Gout, * * * Gravel, Bright's Disease, Diabetes, Dropsy and all Diseases of the Kidneys and Bladder," were false and fraudulent, since the article contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing the effects claimed.

On April 29, 1921, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

9369. Misbranding of tomatoes. U. S. * * * v. William E. McCaslin.
Plea of guilty. Fine, \$25. (F. & D. No. 14308. I. S. No. 2398-t.)

On March 5, 1921, the United States attorney for the Southern District of California, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against

William E. McCaslin, Los Angeles, Calif., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on or about July 27, 1920, from the State of California into the State of Louisiana, of a quantity of tomatoes which were misbranded. The article was labeled, (wrapper) "W. E. McCaslin Co. Packers & Shippers, Los Angeles. Fancy California Tomatoes."

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that it was food in package form, and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package.

On March 28, 1921, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$25.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

9370. Misbranding of Dr. Blackman's Medicated Salt Brick. U. S. * * * v. 3 Cases * * * of Dr. Blackman's Medicated Salt Brick. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 9077. I. S. No. 4861-p. S. No. E-1047.)

On or about June 17, 1918, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of North Carolina, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 3 cases, each containing 30 packages, of Dr. Blackman's Medicated Salt Brick, at Ayden, N. C., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Blackman Stock Remedy Co., Chattanooga, Tenn., on or about April 8, 1918, and transported from the State of Tennessee into the State of North Carolina, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended. The article was labeled in part, "Dr. Blackman's Medicated Salt Brick * * * Has Cured Hog Cholera * * * For Hog Cholera * * * As A Preventative. * * *."

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted essentially of sodium chlorid, potassium nitrate, ferrous sulphate, sulphur, lime, and strychnine.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that the above-quoted statements were false and fraudulent in that the said article was not a cure for and preventative of hog cholera, since it contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing the effect claimed, and the said statements were applied to the said article so as to create in the minds of the purchasers thereof the impression and belief that the article was an effective remedy or preventative for hog cholera, when, in truth and in fact, it was not.

On May 13, 1921, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

9371. Misbranding of Injection Zip. U. S. * * * v. 4½ Dozen Bottles * * * of Injection Zip. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 10879. I. S. No. 15858-r. S. No. E-1628.)

On August 6, 1919, the United States attorney for the Southern District of West Virginia, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 4½ dozen bottles of Injection Zip, at Charleston, W. Va., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Baker-Levy Chemical Co., Indianapolis, Ind., on March 30, 1919, and transported from the State of Indiana into the State of West Virginia, and charging misbranding in violation of the